

Appendix A Public Comments

-----Original Message-----

From: Brandon C Smith [<mailto:brandoncsmith@fs.fed.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2005 8:22 AM
To: Spiering, Colleen A - KEC
Subject: Re: Kootenai pEA

At this point in time, the only items I recommend that you elaborate or clarify the following:

3.11.1: On addition to the last sentence, please add the mitigation items that are going to be performed: tank blending, security, on-site person, etc. I know you have mentioned these items throughout the document, but it adds to the clarity if also placed here.

4.8: The legal description looks good for the NFSL, but for private, the legals should read: "E1/2SW1/4SW1/4SW1/4". The commas in your current version indicate separate aliquot parts.

Brandon Smith
Realty Specialist/Lands
Kootenai NF SO
1101 Hwy 2 West
Libby, MT 59923
Phone: (406) 283-7785
Fax: (406) 283-7709
Email: brandoncsmith@fs.fed.us
~~~~~

**Kuehn, Ginny - DM**

*KRPEA-002*  
APR 22 2005

---

**From:** den123@hctc.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 21, 2005 9:14 PM  
**To:** BPA Public Involvement  
**Subject:** Comment on Kootenai River Ecosystem Restoration

**Comment on Kootenai River Ecosystem Restoration**  
View open comment periods on <http://www.bpa.gov/comment>

Karl Denison  
US Citizen  
den123@hctc.com  
360-898-2618  
1739 E. McReavy WA  
UNION WA 98592

I oppose the adding of liquid N directly into a natural water body. If the purpose is to enhance fish production, then reduce fish harvest and allow more spawners to die. We don't allow septic tank discharge directly into streams and we shouldn't allow man to discharge Liquid N into streams either. Increasing LWD in the riparian zone is another preferred method. Sincerely, Karl Denison

4/22/2005

-----Original Message-----

From: Cleve Shearer [<mailto:idadamont@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, April 24, 2005 9:09 PM

To: Spiering, Colleen A - KEC

Cc: patty@kootenai.org

Subject: Kootenai River Ecosystems Project

We are long time residents of the area and own property and live along the river approximately two miles below the mouth of the canyon. We also very familiar with the Leonia site.

I have fished the river for over forty four years and have seen it decline from a combination of circumstances, mainly (pre- dam) from loss of spawning habitat in tributary streams, loss of wetlands, and upstream pollution, especially mining and pulpmill waste from the Canadian side, and to a lesser extent, the effects of the Zonelite mine on Rainy Creek, the Libby mill on Libby Creek, and sewage from Libby.

The pollution problems have been pretty well resolved, but the problems with side stream spawning habitat remain, and of course, the problems associated with Libby Dam (entrapment of nutrients) and the operation of the dam (fluctuating flows, unnatural flows and temperatures). The BPA has made some effort in recent years to manage the dam so that flows are more natural and there is less short term fluctuation, but low nutrient levels below the mouth of the Yaak remain a serious problem.

I strongly support the program to introduce nutrients at Leonia- unless the river can be made more productive, other efforts to recover species are almost an exercise in futility.

Thank you,  
Cleve Shearer  
PO Box 173  
Bonners Ferry  
Idaho 83805



File Code: 2700

Date: May 4, 2005

Communications - DM -7  
Attn: Colleen Spiering  
Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 14428  
Portland, OR 97293-4428

RE: Kootenai River Ecosystems Project Preliminary EA

Dear Colleen,

In regards to your letter dated April 18, 2005 requesting comments to your preliminary Environmental Analysis, we have the following recommendations/comments:

- 2.1.7: National Forest System Land should be capitalized
- 2.2 No Action Alternative: if BPA doesn't fund the research and placement of nutrients, could the project proceed with other funding?
- Table 2: National Forest System Land should be capitalized
- 3.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences  
There is no discussion of cumulative effects for the various wildlife and fish species addressed other than under Westslope cutthroat trout (3.1.6).  
  
Somewhere in this section, there should be a discussion of what other activities (past, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable activities are being considered in the cumulative effects analysis.) It is also difficult to determine whether the effects discussions refer to private lands, federal lands, or both.
- 3.3.1: No mention of the transition platform, photovoltaic panels and security fence as to the visuals- please elaborate
- 3.3.2: What about moving the PV panels to private land and running wire on the ground to the meters, etc? This may reduce the visual impact to this area.
- 3.8.4 Cumulative Impacts (Cultural Resources): states "no cumulative impacts would occur" even though under 3.8.2 the historic Moyie-Sylanite wagon road would be used to access the tank location, a portion of the road would



be improved, and the private portion of the road had already been impacted by logging activities.

- 3.9.1 Affected Environment (Vegetation): the vegetation description should be focused on the treatment site and adjacent lands. Although the first paragraph provides a good overview of the vegetation types on the Kootenai National Forest and helps to provide context for the discussion, there is virtually no description of the vegetation found on the affected NFS land.

It is stated that the above ground HWM pipe from the tanks to the river would be in Kootenai NF Management Area 13. It also needs to be stated that this management area is Designated Old-Growth Timber. The goal of this management area is to provide the special habitat necessary for old-growth dependent wildlife rather than as the EA describes as "...managed for wildlife habitat, not timber production."

Because of the public concern for management activities in designated old growth, the potential impacts to old growth, particularly on National Forest lands needs to be specifically addressed. Would trees be removed on National Forest lands?

- 3.10.2 Potential Impacts of the Proposed Action: EA states that "erosion control measures would reduce potential impacts." Where are these erosion control measures described?

- 3.11.1: On addition to the last sentence, please add the mitigation items that are going to be performed: tank blending, security, on-site person, etc.

- 4.8: Correct citation for the legal description is: (E1/2SW1/4SW1/4SW1/4 of section 17, Township 33 North, Range 34 West, Principle Meridian Montana as shown on Certificate of Survey No. 2800); and same ending for the notation of the National Forest System Lands

- 4.14.1: This citation is incorrect: the web site may have stated incorrect dates for burn permits outside the City of Libby impact zone. The County is currently reviewing the data to make revisions to the dates. There are two open burning periods each year that do not require burn permits. One period is in the spring and another in the fall after the normal statewide fire season dates of May 1 through September 30.

- 4.1 National Environmental Policy Act: in the last sentence Categorical Conclusion should be Categorical Exclusion.

- 5.0: The correct name for the USDA Forest Service (Troy Ranger Station) is (**Three Rivers** Ranger Station)

Please contact Brandon Smith at (406) 283-7785 with any further communications involving this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bob Castaneda".

BOB CASTANEDA  
Forest Supervisor

cc: Mike Balboni, John Gubel